

### **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-35 will remain pending in this application. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added by the present amendment.

Claims 14, 17-19, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. PG-Publication No. 2003/0069902 (“Narang”). Claims 1, 12, 13, 24 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. PG-Publication No. 2003/0069902 (“Nojima”) in view of Narang. Claims 2 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,035,874 (“Reed”). Claims 3-5, 7-11, 26-28 and 30-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,758 (“Bramford”). Claims 6 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,626 (“Ponnekanti”). Claims 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Narang in view of Reed. Claims 16 and 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Narang in view of Bramford. Applicants respectfully traverse all outstanding rejections.

### ***Interview Summary***

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Dennis Vautrot participated in a telephonic interview on April 3, 2007 to the independent claims in relation to the cited references. No agreement was reached.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)***

Claims 14, 17-19, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. PG-Publication No. 2003/0069902 (“Narang”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 14 and 19 recite that, in response to receiving a file system statement, it is determined if a read (claim 14) or write (claim 19) lock is available for a corresponding row of a data table. The file system statement is independent of any database application programming interface (API) requests.

Narang (¶ 0021) discloses that an application can issue a "SQL API request 40" (e.g., a database API request) to determine whether a picture file from a database is accessible. If the database determines that the application has permission to access the picture file, then the database grants access permission to the application and returns an authorization token to the application along with the file name of the picture. The application then issues a "file API call 70" for the picture. The application submits the authorization token as part of the file API call 70. If the authorization token is successfully validated, then the file API call 70 is accepted.

Thus, in Narang, the application must first acquire database permission to access a picture file prior to issuing the file API call 70 to open the picture file. Accordingly, Narang cannot possibly teach or suggest determining whether read or write access is available "in response to receiving the file system statement that is independent of any database application programming interface requests," as required by independent claims 14 and 19. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 14 and 19 are not anticipated by Narang. Applicants further submit that claims 17, 18, 22 and 23 are patentable at least be reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

#### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1, 12, 13, 24 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. PG-Publication No. 2003/0069902 ("Nojima") in view of Narang.

Independent claims 1 and 24 recite that, in response to receiving a file system statement, a transaction is started by acquiring either a read lock or a write lock on a corresponding row of a data table. The file system statement is independent of any database application programming interface (API) requests.

As described in the previous section, in Narang, the application must first acquire database permission to access a picture file prior to issuing a file API call 70 to open the picture file. Additionally, as noted by the Office Action (Pg. 8), Nojima fails to teach starting the transaction by acquiring either a read lock or a write lock on a corresponding row of a data table. Accordingly, the cited references cannot possibly teach or suggest acquiring either a read lock or a write lock "in response to receiving the file system statement that is independent of any database application programming interface requests," as required by independent claim 1 (or similar language from claim 24). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 24 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that claims 12, 13 and 35 are patentable at least be reason of their dependency.

Claims 2 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,035,874 ("Reed"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that these claims are patentable at least be reason of their dependency.

Claims 3-5, 7-11, 26-28 and 30-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,758 ("Bramford"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that these claims are patentable at least be reason of their dependency.

Claims 6 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,626 ("Ponnekanti"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that these claims are patentable at least be reason of their dependency.

Claims 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Narang in view of Reed. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that these claims are patentable at least be reason of their dependency.

Claims 16 and 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Narang in view of Bramford. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that these claims are patentable at least be reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2924/306986.01  
**Application No.:** 10/797,238  
**Office Action Dated:** March 8, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: May 8, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439